### Online Comment by User: Adventurewagen

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 9:15:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1 Address: 339 N 80th St, Seattle, Wa 98103

Comment:

### I-0007-001

As a Seattle home owner who lives and works on the east side in Issaquah I have to commute each day across 520 or I-90 to get to work. While traffic is a nightmare and ALWAYS stop and go across 520 I don't see adding more lanes and off ramps as a valid solution. It obviously hasn't worked for I-5, 520 or I-90. More lanes just means more people can sit in bumper to bumper next to one another. We need to spend this money on alternative transportation options such as forms of mass transit. This option is a stop gap solution that will do nothing in the end but harm the environment and create yet another eye sore for Seattle the surrounding community.

#### I-0007-002

I am particularly opposed to the 6-Lane alternative as I feel it would negatively impact the environment the most. In addition to the environment it will negatively impact the University of Washington with the Pacific St. Interchange and it looks to destroy a historic landmark in the process, the "UW Rock Climbing Structure". This structure was the first artificial climbing wall built in the nation.

I see no provision outlined for the impact on the UW or specifically the UW Rock in the EIS. There will be great opposition if this is not addressed in the EIS by both UW Alumni such as myself and the rock climbing community of Washington. I will make this a personal mission and recruit UW Alumni, the local community and the greater climbing community osee that the environment, the UW and the Historical UW Rock have reasonable and agreeable provisions for them in the EIS.

Evan Cabodi

## I-0007-001

# **Comment Summary:**

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

## Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

## I-0007-002

# **Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

## Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.